19 October 1969

The Editor
The New York Times Magazine
Times Square
New York City 10036

Dear Sir,

What a pity that former Chief Justice Earl Warren was not questioned more searchingly by Anthony Lewis when he made the astonishing remark that "there has been no confrontation of the facts at all to discredit anything that is in" the WARREN REPORT. Here is an example, never before published, of the numerous falsehoods and misrepresentations in the REPORT.

It asserts on page 198: "Shortly after 1:30 a.m. Oswald was brought to the identification bureau on the fourth floor and arraigned before Justice of the Peace Johnston, this time for the murder of President Kennedy." But here is what is said in Warren Commission Document No. 5, page 400, available in the National Archives At Washington, D. C.:

> "The following information was obtained by (FBI) SA (Special Agent) James P. Hosty, Jr., from the office of Captain Will Fritz, Dallas Police Department, on November 25, 1963...
>
> "No arraignment on the murder charges in connection with the death of President Kennedy was held inasmuch as such arraignment was not necessary in view of the previous charges filed against Oswald and for which he was arraigned."

Which of these irreconcilable statements is true, and which is a deliberate falsification? Consider these facts from the Warren Commission's 26-volume HEARINGS AND EXHIBITS: (1) There was no check-out slip to show that Oswald was removed from his cell at the time of the alleged arraignment, but the records do show Oswald's removal and return on other occasions (HEARINGS, Volume IV pages 221, 247). (2) There was no stenographic record of the arraignment, which is a formal legal proceeding (IV page 156). (3) Detective J. B. Hicks of the Dallas Police Laboratory was at work in the identification bureau until shortly after 2 a.m. but witnessed no arraignment of Oswald, testifying, "I believe I would have known about it had he been arraigned before I left because there is only one door in our office to go out and had any other group been there, I would have noticed it, I believe." (VII page 289).

I conclude from this evidence that the assertion in the WARREN REPORT is a blatant, cynical fabrication. Although Anthony Lewis has made his predilections clear ("And you didn't get much in the way of applause for doing the job, did you?"), I will hope that his integrity as a reporter will lead him now, if belatedly, to challenge Earl Warren's self-serving denial that "anything" in the WARREN REPORT has been discredited. I will even hope that the New York Times finally will place a higher premium on the determination of historical fact than on serving as the public relations bureau for the fraudulent WARREN REPORT.

Yours sincerely,

Sylvia Meagher
302 West 12 Street, NYC, 10014

(Author of the Subject Index to the Warren Report and the Hearings and Exhibits, 1966, and of Accessories After The Fact: The Warren Commission, the Authorities & The Report, 1967)